CONGRESSMAN SHERWOOD BOEHLERT (R-NY)
RULES TESTIMONY ON CAFE AMENDMENT
June 28, 2006

Mr. Chairman:

I am testifying today to urge you to make in order the Boehlert-Markey fuel economy amendment for consideration when we debate the Deep Oil Energy Resources, or DOER, Act.

As I'm sure everyone knows, I oppose the DOER bill. When one is going to be a DOER, one should be careful first to do no harm. And H.R. 4761 would do harm – fiscally and environmentally. But I'll have plenty of time to talk about that on the floor tomorrow.

But what we won't be talking about on the floor tomorrow – unless my amendment is made in order – is energy conservation. Just about every Member of the House, I bet, at one point or another, has made a speech saying that we need to address our energy needs both by increasing the energy supply and by reducing energy demand. It's a kind of "apple pie" statement.

But no one is allowing us to bake that "apple pie." We have had a vote this year on drilling in the Arctic, and now we'll have a vote on drilling off our coasts, but we haven't had a single vote on conservation. It's unconscionable really. And it's also foolish – because we won't drill our way to security. All we do through drilling is deplete the supplies we'll need in the future more quickly.

Now, I know the attitude of the Rules Committee toward this amendment – you'll say that it's not germane to the matter at hand. If that's the case, it's only true in legislative parlance. In reality, nothing could be more germane – more relevant – when debating whether to open the nation's coastlines to oil drilling than to debate whether we're going to do anything to limit our future need for oil.

I frankly don't have much hope that this amendment will be made in order. But I think that if it is not made in order, we will be proving that this House cares nothing about energy security; we care only about ideology and special interests.

I urge that you let the House have a debate on how we use oil as well as how we drill for it. Thank you.